



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,774	12/09/2003	Markus Stolze	CH920020035US1	4804
7590 10/19/2007				
IBM Corporation Intellectual Property Law Dept. P.O. Box 218 Yorktown Heights, NY 10598			EXAMINER PATEL, HARESH N	
			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/730,774

Applicant(s)

STOLZE, MARKUS

Examiner

Haresh Patel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 December 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-17 are subject to examination.

Priority

2. Applicant's claim for foreign priority, EPO 02406092.3 12/12/2002, under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) or (f), is acknowledged.

Specification

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The present title, address completion, is too broad and is not sufficient for proper classification of the claimed subject matter.

Drawings

4. New corrected drawings are required in this application because figure 1 contains incomplete rectangles. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled --Replacement Sheet-- in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the

Art Unit: 2154

drawing figures. If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. Note: No prior arts have been submitted prior to the examination. EPO 02406092.3 12/12/2002 is not a prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 13, 15, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter. The claims 13, 15 and 17 contain a computer usable medium, which is not a computer storage medium such as memory, which does not fall into any of the statutory categories.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

Art Unit: 2154

international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

8. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tafoya et al.

6,829,607, Microsoft Corporation, (Hereinafter Tafoya-Microsoft).

9. Referring to claim 1, Tafoya-Microsoft discloses a method executed in a computer system for completing an address (e.g., col., 4), the method comprising the steps of: detecting an incomplete user input of the address (e.g., col., 4); deriving a completion offer to the incomplete user input in dependence on a derivable score (e.g., col., 4); and offering the derived completion offer for completing the address (e.g., col., 5).

10. Referring to claim 2, Tafoya-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Tafoya-Microsoft also discloses wherein the completion offer comprises a list of address completions, the list is ordered in accordance with the derivable score (e.g., col., 5).

11. Referring to claim 3, Tafoya-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Tafoya-Microsoft also discloses wherein the step of offering comprises presenting the list of address completions (e.g., col., 6).

Art Unit: 2154

12. Referring to claim 4, Tafoya-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Tafoya-Microsoft also discloses wherein the step of deriving comprises determining the completion offer based on a score order (e.g., col., 8).

13. Referring to claim 5, Tafoya-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Tafoya-Microsoft also discloses wherein the derivable score is a context dependent address score (e.g., col., 7).

14. Referring to claim 6, Tafoya-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Tafoya-Microsoft also discloses wherein the step of deriving comprises defining at least one possible address based on the incomplete user input (e.g., col., 8).

15. Referring to claim 7, Tafoya-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Tafoya-Microsoft also discloses wherein the step of deriving further comprises assigning one context dependent address score to the or each possible address, and including the or each possible address in the completion offer in dependence on the or each assigned context dependent address score (e.g., col., 10).

16. Referring to claim 8, Tafoya-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Tafoya-Microsoft also discloses wherein a base score is derived from the content of one or more of a user organizational context record, a user address book, an incoming mail record, an outgoing mail record, an address record (e.g., col., 12).

17. Referring to claim 9, Tafoya-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Tafoya-Microsoft also discloses wherein the context dependent address score is derived from the base score and from one or more of a user typed address fragment, recently opened addresses, addresses used in recent communication, recent completion corrections (e.g., col., 11).

18. Referring to claim 10, Tafoya-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Tafoya-Microsoft also discloses wherein the base score decreases over time and thereby influences the derivable score (e.g., col., 14).

19. Referring to claim 11, Tafoya-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Tafoya-Microsoft also discloses wherein the address is one of a mail address, an e-mail address, or a phone number (e.g., col., 9).

20. Referring to claim 12, Tafoya-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Tafoya-Microsoft also discloses a computer program element comprising program code means for performing the method of claim 1 when said program is run on a computer (e.g., col., 4).

21. Referring to claim 13, Tafoya-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Tafoya-Microsoft also discloses a computer program product stored on a computer usable

medium, comprising computer readable program means for causing a computer to perform the method according to claim 1 (e.g., col., 4).

22. Referring to claim 14, Tafoya-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Tafoya-Microsoft also discloses an apparatus for completing an address (e.g., col., 4), the apparatus comprising: a logic configured to detect an incomplete user input of the address (e.g., col., 4); a logic configured to derive a completion offer to the incomplete user input in dependence on a derivable score (e.g., col., 4); and a logic configured to offer the derived completion offer for completing the address (e.g., col., 5).

23. Referring to claim 15, Tafoya-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Tafoya-Microsoft also discloses a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing completion of an address the computer readable program code means in said computer program product comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the functions of claim 14 (e.g., col., 4).

24. Referring to claim 16, Tafoya-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Tafoya-Microsoft also discloses an apparatus for completing an address (e.g., col., 4), the apparatus comprising: means for detecting an incomplete user input of the address (e.g., col., 4); means for deriving a completion offer to the incomplete user input in dependence on a derivable

Art Unit: 2154

score (e.g., col., 4); and means for offering the derived completion offer for completing the address (e.g., col., 5).

25. Referring to claim 17, Tafoya-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Tafoya-Microsoft also discloses a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing completion of an address the computer readable program code means in said computer program product comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the functions of claim 16 (e.g., col., 4).

26. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Plow et al. 2003/0028792, IBM, (Hereinafter Plow-IBM).

27. Referring to claim 1, Plow-IBM discloses a method executed in a computer system for completing an address (e.g., page 2), the method comprising the steps of: detecting an incomplete user input of the address (e.g., page 2); deriving a completion offer to the incomplete user input in dependence on a derivable score (e.g., page 2); and offering the derived completion offer for completing the address (e.g., page 3).

28. Referring to claim 2, Plow-IBM discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Plow-IBM also discloses wherein the completion offer comprises a list of address completions, the list is ordered in accordance with the derivable score (e.g., page 3).

29. Referring to claim 3, Plow-IBM discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Plow-IBM also discloses wherein the step of offering comprises presenting the list of address completions (e.g., page 3).

30. Referring to claim 4, Plow-IBM discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Plow-IBM also discloses wherein the step of deriving comprises determining the completion offer based on a score order (e.g., page 3).

31. Referring to claim 5, Plow-IBM discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Plow-IBM also discloses wherein the derivable score is a context dependent address score (e.g., page 3).

32. Referring to claim 6, Plow-IBM discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Plow-IBM also discloses wherein the step of deriving comprises defining at least one possible address based on the incomplete user input (e.g., page 3).

33. Referring to claim 7, Plow-IBM discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Plow-IBM also discloses wherein the step of deriving further comprises assigning one context dependent address score to the or each possible address, and including the or each possible address in the completion offer in dependence on the or each assigned context dependent address score (e.g., page 3).

34. Referring to claim 8, Plow-IBM discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Plow-IBM also discloses wherein a base score is derived from the content of one or more of a user organizational context record, a user address book, an incoming mail record, an outgoing mail record, an address record (e.g., page 3).

35. Referring to claim 9, Plow-IBM discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Plow-IBM also discloses wherein the context dependent address score is derived from the base score and from one or more of a user typed address fragment, recently opened addresses, addresses used in recent communication, recent completion corrections (e.g., page 3).

36. Referring to claim 10, Plow-IBM discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Plow-IBM also discloses wherein the base score decreases over time and thereby influences the derivable score (e.g., page 3).

37. Referring to claim 11, Plow-IBM discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Plow-IBM also discloses wherein the address is one of a mail address, an e-mail address, or a phone number (e.g., page 3).

38. Referring to claim 12, Plow-IBM discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Plow-IBM also discloses a computer program element comprising program code means for performing the method of claim 1 when said program is run on a computer (e.g., page 2).

39. Referring to claim 13, Plow-IBM discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Plow-IBM also discloses a computer program product stored on a computer usable medium, comprising computer readable program means for causing a computer to perform the method according to claim 1 (e.g., page 2).

40. Referring to claim 14, Plow-IBM discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Plow-IBM also discloses an apparatus for completing an address (e.g., page 2), the apparatus comprising: a logic configured to detect an incomplete user input of the address (e.g., page 2); a logic configured to derive a completion offer to the incomplete user input in dependence on a derivable score (e.g., page 2); and a logic configured to offer the derived completion offer for completing the address (e.g., page 3).

41. Referring to claim 15, Plow-IBM discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Plow-IBM also discloses a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing completion of an address the computer readable program code means in said computer program product comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the functions of claim 14 (e.g., page 2).

42. Referring to claim 16, Plow-IBM discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Plow-IBM also discloses an apparatus for completing an address (e.g., page 2), the apparatus

Art Unit: 2154

comprising: means for detecting an incomplete user input of the address (e.g., page 2); means for deriving a completion offer to the incomplete user input in dependence on a derivable score (e.g., page 2); and means for offering the derived completion offer for completing the address (e.g., page 3).

43. Referring to claim 17, Plow-IBM discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Plow-IBM also discloses a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing completion of an address the computer readable program code means in said computer program product comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the functions of claim 16 (e.g., page 2).

44. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Jiang et al. 2002//0057678 (Hereinafter Jiang).

45. Referring to claim 1, Jiang discloses a method executed in a computer system for completing an address (e.g., page 20), the method comprising the steps of: detecting an incomplete user input of the address (e.g., page 20); deriving a completion offer to the incomplete user input in dependence on a derivable score (e.g., page 20); and offering the derived completion offer for completing the address (e.g., page 21).

46. Referring to claim 2, Jiang discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Jiang also discloses wherein the completion offer comprises a list of address completions, the list is ordered in accordance with the derivable score (e.g., page 21).

47. Referring to claim 3, Jiang discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Jiang also discloses wherein the step of offering comprises presenting the list of address completions (e.g., page 21).

48. Referring to claim 4, Jiang discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Jiang also discloses wherein the step of deriving comprises determining the completion offer based on a score order (e.g., page 21).

49. Referring to claim 5, Jiang discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Jiang also discloses wherein the derivable score is a context dependent address score (e.g., page 21).

50. Referring to claim 6, Jiang discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Jiang also discloses wherein the step of deriving comprises defining at least one possible address based on the incomplete user input (e.g., page 21).

51. Referring to claim 7, Jiang discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Jiang also discloses wherein the step of deriving further comprises assigning one context dependent address score to the or each possible address, and including the or each possible address in the

Art Unit: 2154

completion offer in dependence on the or each assigned context dependent address score (e.g., page 21).

52. Referring to claim 8, Jiang discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Jiang also discloses wherein a base score is derived from the content of one or more of a user organizational context record, a user address book, an incoming mail record, an outgoing mail record, an address record (e.g., page 21).

53. Referring to claim 9, Jiang discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Jiang also discloses wherein the context dependent address score is derived from the base score and from one or more of a user typed address fragment, recently opened addresses, addresses used in recent communication, recent completion corrections (e.g., page 21).

54. Referring to claim 10, Jiang discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Jiang also discloses wherein the base score decreases over time and thereby influences the derivable score (e.g., page 21).

55. Referring to claim 11, Jiang discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Jiang also discloses wherein the address is one of a mail address, an e-mail address, or a phone number (e.g., page 21).

56. Referring to claim 12, Jiang discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Jiang also discloses a computer program element comprising program code means for performing the method of claim 1 when said program is run on a computer (e.g., page 20).

57. Referring to claim 13, Jiang discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Jiang also discloses a computer program product stored on a computer usable medium, comprising computer readable program means for causing a computer to perform the method according to claim 1 (e.g., page 20).

58. Referring to claim 14, Jiang discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Jiang also discloses an apparatus for completing an address (e.g., page 20), the apparatus comprising: a logic configured to detect an incomplete user input of the address (e.g., page 20); a logic configured to derive a completion offer to the incomplete user input in dependence on a derivable score (e.g., page 20); and a logic configured to offer the derived completion offer for completing the address (e.g., page 21).

59. Referring to claim 15, Jiang discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Jiang also discloses a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing completion of an address the computer readable program code means in said computer program product comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the functions of claim 14 (e.g., page 20).

60. Referring to claim 16, Jiang discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Jiang also discloses an apparatus for completing an address (e.g., page 20), the apparatus comprising: means for detecting an incomplete user input of the address (e.g., page 20); means for deriving a completion offer to the incomplete user input in dependence on a derivable score (e.g., page 20); and means for offering the derived completion offer for completing the address (e.g., page 21).

61. Referring to claim 17, Jiang discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Jiang also discloses a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing completion of an address the computer readable program code means in said computer program product comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the functions of claim 16 (e.g., page 20).

62. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cortright et al. 6,895,426, Microsoft Corporation, (Hereinafter Cortright-Microsoft).

63. Referring to claim 1, Cortright-Microsoft discloses a method executed in a computer system for completing an address (e.g., col., 4), the method comprising the steps of: detecting an incomplete user input of the address (e.g., col., 4); deriving a completion offer to the incomplete user input in dependence on a derivable score (e.g., col., 4); and offering the derived completion offer for completing the address (e.g., col., 5).

64. Referring to claim 2, Cortright-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Cortright-Microsoft also discloses wherein the completion offer comprises a list of address completions, the list is ordered in accordance with the derivable score (e.g., col., 5).

65. Referring to claim 3, Cortright-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Cortright-Microsoft also discloses wherein the step of offering comprises presenting the list of address completions (e.g., col., 6).

66. Referring to claim 4, Cortright-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Cortright-Microsoft also discloses wherein the step of deriving comprises determining the completion offer based on a score order (e.g., col., 8).

67. Referring to claim 5, Cortright-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Cortright-Microsoft also discloses wherein the derivable score is a context dependent address score (e.g., col., 7).

68. Referring to claim 6, Cortright-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Cortright-Microsoft also discloses wherein the step of deriving comprises defining at least one possible address based on the incomplete user input (e.g., col., 8).

Art Unit: 2154

69. Referring to claim 7, Cortright-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Cortright-Microsoft also discloses wherein the step of deriving further comprises assigning one context dependent address score to the or each possible address, and including the or each possible address in the completion offer in dependence on the or each assigned context dependent address score (e.g., col., 10).

70. Referring to claim 8, Cortright-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Cortright-Microsoft also discloses wherein a base score is derived from the content of one or more of a user organizational context record, a user address book, an incoming mail record, an outgoing mail record, an address record (e.g., col., 9).

71. Referring to claim 9, Cortright-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Cortright-Microsoft also discloses wherein the context dependent address score is derived from the base score and from one or more of a user typed address fragment, recently opened addresses, addresses used in recent communication, recent completion corrections (e.g., col., 8).

72. Referring to claim 10, Cortright-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Cortright-Microsoft also discloses wherein the base score decreases over time and thereby influences the derivable score (e.g., col., 8).

Art Unit: 2154

73. Referring to claim 11, Cortright-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Cortright-Microsoft also discloses wherein the address is one of a mail address, an e-mail address, or a phone number (e.g., col., 9).

74. Referring to claim 12, Cortright-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Cortright-Microsoft also discloses a computer program element comprising program code means for performing the method of claim 1 when said program is run on a computer (e.g., col., 7).

75. Referring to claim 13, Cortright-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Cortright-Microsoft also discloses a computer program product stored on a computer usable medium, comprising computer readable program means for causing a computer to perform the method according to claim 1 (e.g., col., 4).

76. Referring to claim 14, Cortright-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Cortright-Microsoft also discloses an apparatus for completing an address (e.g., col., 4), the apparatus comprising: a logic configured to detect an incomplete user input of the address (e.g., col., 4); a logic configured to derive a completion offer to the incomplete user input in dependence on a derivable score (e.g., col., 4); and a logic configured to offer the derived completion offer for completing the address (e.g., col., 5).

77. Referring to claim 15, Cortright-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Cortright-Microsoft also discloses a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing completion of an address the computer readable program code means in said computer program product comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the functions of claim 14 (e.g., col., 4).

78. Referring to claim 16, Cortright-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Cortright-Microsoft also discloses an apparatus for completing an address (e.g., col., 4), the apparatus comprising: means for detecting an incomplete user input of the address (e.g., col., 4); means for deriving a completion offer to the incomplete user input in dependence on a derivable score (e.g., col., 4); and means for offering the derived completion offer for completing the address (e.g., col., 5).

79. Referring to claim 17, Cortright-Microsoft discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Cortright-Microsoft also discloses a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing completion of an address the computer readable program code means in said computer program product comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the functions of claim 16 (e.g., col., 4).

Conclusion

Multiple references are used for the rejections to demonstrate that several references disclose the broadly claimed subject matter of the claims.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn, can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

 Haresh Patel

Haresh Patel

September 27, 2007